

Time dependent Green functions in Quantum Cosmology

R. Parentani¹

Laboratoire de Physique Théorique de l'École Normale Supérieure²
24 rue Lhomond, 75.231 Paris CEDEX 05, France.
e-mail: parenta@celfi.phys.univ-tours.fr

Abstract The aim of this article is twofold. First we examine from a new angle the question of the recovery of time in quantum cosmology. We construct Green functions for matter fields from the solutions of the Wheeler De Witt equation. For simplicity we work in a mini-superspace context. By evaluating these Green functions in a first order development of the energy *increment* induced by matrix elements of field operators, we show that the background geometry is the solution of Einstein equations driven by the mean matter energy and that it is this background which determines the time lapses separating the field operators. Then, by studying higher order corrections, we clarify the nature of the small dimensionless parameters which guarantee the validity of the approximations used. In this respect, we show that the formal expansion in the inverse Planck mass which is sometime presented as the “standard procedure” is illegitimate. Secondly, by the present analysis of Green functions, we prepare the study of quantum matter transitions in quantum cosmology. In a next article, we show that the time parametrization of transition amplitudes appears for the same reasons that it appeared in this article. This proves that the background is dynamically determined by the transition under examination.

¹ present address: Laboratoire de Mathématique et Physique Théorique, Faculté des Sciences,
Université de Tours, 37200 Tours, France

²Unité propre de recherche du C.N.R.S. associée à l'ENS et à l'Université de Paris Sud.

1 Introduction

In General Relativity, the invariance under reparametrizations in time and in space leads to a set of local constraints. These impose that the total four-momentum of matter + gravity vanishes identically. Therefore, in contrast to the usual classical and quantum mechanics, there is no preferred reference frame to specify when and where events occur. This absence of external reference frame can also be conceived as arising from the dynamical character of space-time. Hence, since space-time is coupled to all matter transitions, it is coupled to the particular event we want to localize. Therefore, in a weak perturbation limit, the matter-gravity correlations resulting from the constraints should deliver the historical description of events performed in the background geometry. Then two questions arise:

How to extract from the total wave function of the universe the properties of the background geometry in which time lapses are defined ?

Under what circumstances is the extraction of a non-dynamical background a legitimate approximation ?

Both questions have received attention and we refer to [1][2][3] for reviews in which various attempts are compared. We recall that it has been shown in [4][5][6] how, starting from the solutions of the Wheeler-De Witt equation, the semi-classical character of gravity leads to the Schroedinger equation for matter fields. This treatment has been pursued in [7][8][9][10][11] and both higher order corrections and the criteria for having reliable approximations have been discussed. However there is no consensus on the manner to identify the background. In refs. [5][11][12][13], the development in a power series of $1/G$ (Newton's constant) leads inevitably to backgrounds which are *empty* solutions of Einstein equations. Instead, in refs. [6][7][10], it was proposed that the background solution must contain the *mean* matter energy as a source, in a manner similar to what happens in a Born-Oppenheimer treatment: in the adiabatic approximation, the protons feel the *mean* Coulomb potential delivered by the electrons.

In this paper, we settle this debate and prove, in conformity with [6][9][10], that the background solution is the Einstein solution driven by the mean matter content. To reach this conclusion we proceed as follows. Instead of focusing on the wave function of the universe itself, in which matter and gravity are treated on a same footing, we center our attention on matter matrix elements evaluated at some given gravitational configuration. In particular, we analyze matter Green functions wherein the two insertions of the field operator are performed at two different radii of the universe. This un-symmetrical treatment in which a restricted number of matter quanta are involved determines unambiguously what is the background geometry and what are the developments which lead to the localization of quantum matter effects. The small parameter controlling these developments is the *relative change* of matter energy induced by the insertion of the field operators appearing in the Green function itself.

This is as it should be: given a certain matrix element, the validity of the background field approximation puts constraints on the *sources* of the background field, see Chapter 14 in [14]. Therefore the Planck mass has nothing to do with its validity nor does it govern its corrections. The corrections to the background field approximation are of

two kinds. One has the corrections to the WKB approximation for the propagation of gravity, see [11], and the nonlinear dependence of the geometry in the energy change. At this point, it is relevant to notice the close analogy between the present development leading to the concept of *time* and the procedure by which a big isolated system furnishes a *temperature* to a little system contained in it. Both equilibrium concepts, i.e. time and inverse temperature, are obtained through a *first order* change in the energy and determined by the properties of the big system. Moreover, the second order corrections, which control the validity of these equilibrium notions, have the same origin: the big system is finite and has therefore a finite specific heat.

Very important also is that only a small part of the corrections to the WKB approximation affects the value of the Green functions. Indeed, only that part which is sensitive to the matter energy change modifies the Green functions. This has two important consequences. First, for matter dominated universes, the modifications of the Green functions due to these WKB corrections are irrelevant since they are one higher order than modifications induced by the non-linearities. Secondly, the validity of the WKB approximation is much less restrictive than the one applied on the full wave function of the universe.

Finally, we clarify the role of the spread of the matter energy in the universe. In former works, see e.g. [10][13], the problem of the recovery of time was considered together with the validity of representing gravity by a *single* background. In this work, we emphasize that these two problems should be considered separately. Indeed we show that *each* component of the wave function defines its own time lapse. Therefore large spreads are perfectly acceptable. Simply the notion of a *single* background defining a *single* time valid for all configurations loses sense. But this has no physical consequences, since remote configurations do not interfere.

In the next paper[20], we define and evaluate the amplitudes of matter transitions in the framework of quantum cosmology. Upon evaluating these amplitudes, we shall see that a time parametrization is provided for the same reasons that time appeared in our Green functions, *i.e.* through a first order change of the energy change induced by the transition itself. We emphasize this point: Time appears because there is a transition, more precisely, time appears because there is an interaction hamiltonian which determines the probability amplitude to have a transition. This legitimizes dynamically the analysis of the present paper which is purely kinematical.

In this paper we proceed as follows. We consider two different matter fields, a massive one and a massless one conformally coupled. This allows us

- a. to reveal how, by using gauge independent quantities, proper time lapses characterize Green functions of the massive field whereas it is the conformal time which appears in the massless field's functions;
- b. to show how the appearance of these time lapses relies on a *double* development: a WKB approximation for the kernel of gravity together with a first order development in the change of energy induced by the field operator involved in the Green function;
- c. to show how the spectator field, not directly involved in the Green function, determines indirectly this function through its energy. Indeed, its energy contributes to the determination of the background geometry in terms of which time lapses are, in

turn, defined; and

d. to analyze the corrections to these approximations and the physical conditions under which these corrections can be correctly discarded.

All of these developments are done in the mini-superspace context, i.e. both the field configurations and the field operators are homogeneous and carry zero momentum. At the end of the article, we consider an extension of the formalism in which the momenta no longer vanish.

2 Why study Green functions ?

In this section we compare the time dependence of the Green functions of an harmonic oscillator to the time dependence of its wave function. The technical reason for comparing these well known features is to make the reader aware of the different roles that the total matter energy and the energy change induced by the insertions of the fields operators will play upon considering, in Section 4, Green functions from the solutions of the Wheeler De Witt (WDW) equation. In that Section, we shall see that the total matter energy determines the background solution whereas the energy change characterizes the phase of the Green function.

The physical justification for considering Green functions is the usual one: their study prepares the analysis of transitions amplitudes among matter constituents in quantum field theory. To study these transitions amplitudes in the framework of quantum cosmology is precisely the subject of [20].

In non-relativistic quantum mechanics, in the Schroedinger picture, the time dependence of the state of the system is governed by the following equation

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = e^{-iH(t-t_0)/\hbar}|\Psi_0\rangle \quad (1)$$

where $|\Psi_0\rangle$ is the wave function specified at $t = t_0$.

When the system is in an eigenstate of the energy, this equation reduces to

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = e^{-iE(t-t_0)/\hbar}|\Psi_0\rangle \quad (2)$$

where E is the *total* energy of the system. For instance, for a harmonic oscillator in the n -th level, one has $E = E_n = \hbar\omega (n + 1/2)$.

We now consider the time dependence of Green functions. This is usually done in the Heisenberg picture upon dealing with the time dependent Heisenberg operators $q(t) = e^{iH(t-t_0)/\hbar}q e^{-iH(t-t_0)/\hbar}$. For instance, for an harmonic oscillator, whose state at $t = t_0$ is $|\Psi_0\rangle$, the Green function is given by

$$G_q(t_2, t_1) = \langle \Psi_0 | q(t_2) q(t_1) | \Psi_0 \rangle \quad (3)$$

When $|\Psi_0\rangle$ is the eigenstate $|n\rangle$ of energy E_n , one finds

$$G_q^n(t_2, t_1) = \frac{1}{2\omega} \left(n e^{i\omega(t_2-t_1)} + (n+1) e^{-i\omega(t_2-t_1)} \right) \quad (4)$$

The differences between state propagation in eq. (2) and Green function time dependence are manifest upon computing eq. (4) in the Schroedinger picture:

$$\begin{aligned}
G_q^n(t_2, t_1) &= \langle n | e^{iH(t_0-t_2)/\hbar} q e^{-iH(t_2-t_1)/\hbar} q e^{-iH(t_1-t_0)/\hbar} | n \rangle \\
&= \langle n | q e^{-iH(t_2-t_1)/\hbar} q e^{-iH(t_1-t_2)/\hbar} | n \rangle \\
&= \left[\langle n | \frac{a^\dagger a}{2\omega} | n \rangle e^{-i(E_n - \hbar\omega)(t_2-t_1)/\hbar} + \langle n | \frac{aa^\dagger}{2\omega} | n \rangle e^{-i(E_n + \hbar\omega)(t_2-t_1)/\hbar} \right] e^{iE_n(t_1-t_2)/\hbar} \\
&= \frac{n}{2\omega} e^{i\omega(t_2-t_1)} + \frac{n+1}{2\omega} e^{-i\omega(t_2-t_1)} \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have introduced the (Schroedinger) time independent expectation value $\langle n | aa^\dagger | n \rangle = n + 1$. The total energy E_n drops out the phase of the Green function. Only $\pm\omega$, the energy changes induced by the q operators, survive. This will be extremely important in the quantum cosmology. In that context, the Green functions are delivered in the Schroedinger form, as in the third line of eq. (5). Furthermore, the two independent matter energy scales $\hbar\omega$, the (microscopic) *change* in energy induced by the operator q , and $E_n = n\hbar\omega$, the (macroscopic) energy in the universe, play completely different roles[9]. Indeed, it is by a development in $1/n$ that the background solution characterized by the total energy is isolated. Furthermore, higher order terms in $1/n$ determine the corrections induced by the fact that geometry is dynamical and can only be approximated by a single passive background.

The other difference is that the Green function is independent of t_0 , i.e. of the initial phase of the wave function and depends only in the lapse between t_2 and t_1 . This local character will also play an important role in the WDW context since only local corrections will enter into the nonlinear response of gravity.

However it should be pointed out that upon dealing with a superposition, $|\Psi_0\rangle = \sum_n c_n |n\rangle$, a dependence in t_0 and $t_2 + t_1$ does appear. Indeed one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
G_q^{c_n}(t_2, t_1) &= \sum_n |c_n|^2 \frac{1}{2\omega} \left(n e^{i\omega(t_2-t_1)} + (n+1) e^{-i\omega(t_2-t_1)} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_n 2 \operatorname{Re} \left[\frac{1}{2\omega} c_n c_{n-2}^* \sqrt{n(n-1)} e^{-i\omega(t_2+t_1-2t_0)} \right] \tag{6}
\end{aligned}$$

The dependence on t_0 and $t_2 + t_1$ emerges from the *interfering* terms relating $|n\rangle$ to $|n \pm 2\rangle$. Therefore, when the system is described by a density matrix which is diagonal in energy, i.e. $\hat{\rho} = \sum_n \rho_n |n\rangle \langle n|$, the interfering terms do not exist and one has

$$G_q^\rho(t_2, t_1) = \operatorname{Tr}[\hat{\rho} q(t_2) q(t_1)] = \sum_n \rho_n \frac{1}{2\omega} \left(n e^{i\omega(t_2-t_1)} + (n+1) e^{-i\omega(t_2-t_1)} \right) \tag{7}$$

Because of this simplicity, in Section 4, we shall first consider Green function arising from diagonal density matrices and only then discuss the new aspects brought in by the interfering terms.

3 The cosmological model

We recall the main features of the dynamics in mini-superspace, see *e.g.* [1][2]. We put special emphasis on the relationship between the matter energy content of a universe and

lapses of proper time evaluated in that universe. The reason for this emphasis is that the time parametrization reappears in quantum cosmology through this relationship.

To make this as clear as possible, we choose the matter content in a such a way that its state is characterized by constants of motion. This allows to write the Hamilton-Jacobi action as a sum of actions and the wave function as a sum of products. Because of the simplicity of this model, the modifications introduced by the quantum character of gravity will be easily identified and evaluated. More elaborate situations will be consider afterwards. In Appendix A, we leave the mini-superspace restriction and in [20], we introduce interactions which cause the “constants of motion” to evolve.

We consider a cosmological model with both massive and massless matter fields. For the massive field, we impose that the mass M be large enough that its Compton wave length satisfies

$$\frac{\hbar}{M} \ll \frac{a}{\dot{a}} \quad (8)$$

where $\dot{a} = da/dt$ with t being the proper time of the universe, i.e. when the lapse satisfies $N = 1$. We recall that, in mini-superspace, the metric element reads

$$ds^2 = -N^2(\xi)d\xi^2 + a^2(\xi)d^2\Omega_3 \quad (9)$$

where $N(\xi)$ is the lapse and where $d^2\Omega_3$ is the constant line element of the homogeneous three surfaces.

When eq. (8) is satisfied, there is no pair production of massive quanta and the action of an homogeneous massive scalar field $\tilde{\psi}(t)$ is correctly approximated by (from now on we put $\hbar = 1$)

$$S_M = \frac{1}{2} \int dt (\dot{\psi}^2 - M^2\psi^2) \quad (10)$$

where the field $\psi(t)$ is related to the original scalar $\tilde{\psi}(t)$ by $\psi(t) = a^{3/2}(t)\tilde{\psi}(t)$. Indeed one verifies that the differences between the original field equation and the harmonic (adiabatic) equation for $\psi(t)$ scale like $(\dot{a}/aM)^2 \ll 1$. Non adiabatic corrections, which govern pair creation amplitudes, will be considered in [21].

For the massless conformally coupled field, see [16], its action is

$$S_\gamma = \frac{1}{2} \int d\eta ((\partial_\eta \phi)^2 - k^2 \phi^2) = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{dt}{a} (a^2 \dot{\phi}^2 - k^2 \phi^2) \quad (11)$$

where $d\eta = dt/a(t)$ defines the conformal time. In that gauge, $N(\eta) = a(\eta)$. The field ϕ is related to the original massless field $\tilde{\phi}$ by $\phi = a\tilde{\phi}$.

The total energy of matter (when $N = 1$) is given by

$$H_m(a) = M|A_M|^2 + \frac{k}{a}|A_\gamma|^2 \quad (12)$$

where A_M, A_γ are the classical amplitudes of the ψ field and the ϕ field whose norms are *conserved*, i.e. are a independent.

The action for gravity is given by the Einstein lagrangian. When restricted to the conformal mode in the proper time gauge is reduces to

$$S_G = \frac{1}{2G} \int dt (-a \dot{a}^2 - \kappa a - \Lambda a^3) \quad (13)$$

where κ is equal to 0, $\pm$ for flat, open or closed three surfaces, where Λ is a cosmological constant and where G is Newton's constant. Notice the minus sign of the kinetic term of a . This is a common feature of reparametrization invariant theories. In the present case, the total hamiltonian of gravity plus matter is constrained to vanish in order to guarantee the invariance under time reparametrizations. In terms of the momentum of gravity, π_a , this constraint is given by

$$H_G + H_m = \left(\frac{-G^2 \pi_a^2 + \kappa a^2 + \Lambda a^4}{2Ga} \right) + \left(M|A_M|^2 + \frac{k}{a}|A_\gamma|^2 \right) = 0 \quad (14)$$

where π_a is related to a and to the proper time t by

$$\pi_a = -\frac{a\dot{a}}{G} \quad (15)$$

The use of the momentum π_a allows to write the constraint without any reference to the lapse N , i.e. in a gauge independent manner. Thus, for a given matter content, in our case with A_M, A_γ specified, π is determined (up to a sign) by the constraint eq. (14)

$$\pi(a, E_M, E_\gamma) = -G^{-1} \sqrt{\kappa a^2 + \Lambda a^4 + 2Ga \left(E_M + \frac{E_\gamma}{a} \right)} \quad (16)$$

where $E_M = M|A_M|^2$ is the energy of the massive field and $E_\gamma = k|A_\gamma|^2$ the “conformal” energy of the massless field. The sign ambiguity is fixed by restricting ourselves to expanding universes, i.e. $\dot{a} > 0$. Therefore, instead of determining π in terms of a given $a(t)$, eq. (15) should be considered as determining the proper time t in terms of π and a having specified the matter content. Indeed one has

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta t(a_2, a_1; E_M, E_\gamma) &= - \int_{a_1}^{a_2} da \frac{a}{G \pi(a, E_M, E_\gamma)} \\ &= -\partial_{E_M} \int_{a_1}^{a_2} da \pi(a, E_M, E_\gamma) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Similarly, the lapse of conformal time $\Delta\eta$ is determined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\eta(a_2, a_1; E_M, E_\gamma) &= - \int_{a_1}^{a_2} da \frac{1}{G \pi(a, E_M, E_\gamma)} \\ &= -\partial_{E_\gamma} \int_{a_1}^{a_2} da \pi(a, E_M, E_\gamma) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

In the second lines of eqs. (17, 18), we have expressed the fact that the proper time t is, *by definition*, the conjugate variable of the energy E_M and the conformal time η is the conjugate variable of the conformal energy E_γ . In both cases, it is the gravitational part of the action, i.e. $S_G = \int da \pi_a$, see below eq. (21), which is used to define the conjugate variable. By using the angle-action terminology, we can say that the proper time is the “angle” conjugated to the “action” E_M , see e.g. [17] for a brief and clear presentation of these concepts. When using the solutions of the WDW equation to

evaluate Green functions in quantum cosmology, we shall see that it is through these equations that time lapses will be defined and determined, answering therefore point a. of the Introduction. Moreover, these Hamilton-Jacobi equations make manifest the analogy with the inverse temperature which is defined in a microcanonical ensemble as the derivative of the entropy with respect to the energy, see eq. (64).

Since A_M and A_γ are conserved, the Hamilton-Jacobi action is a *sum* of three actions

$$S(a, \psi, \phi) = S_G(a; E_M, E_\gamma) + S_M^{o.h.}(\psi; A_M) + S_\gamma^{o.h.}(\phi; A_\gamma) \quad (19)$$

where the matter actions are the actions for harmonic oscillators of amplitude A and respective frequency M and k . The gravitational part of the action satisfies

$$-G^2(\partial_a S_G(a))^2 + \kappa a^2 + \Lambda a^4 + 2Ga \left(E_M + \frac{E_\gamma}{a} \right) = 0 \quad (20)$$

Since S_G depends on a single variable only, it is entirely determined by the classical momentum, eq. (16), by

$$S_G(a; E_M, E_\gamma) = \int_{a_1}^{a_2} da \pi(a, E_M, E_\gamma) \quad (21)$$

Upon quantizing the system, the conservation of the energies E_M and E_γ implies that the wave function factorizes into a sum of *products* of waves

$$\Psi(a, \psi, \phi) = \sum_{n_M, n_\gamma} c_{n_M, n_\gamma} \Psi(a; n_M, n_\gamma) \langle \psi | n_M \rangle \langle \phi | n_\gamma \rangle \quad (22)$$

The matter states $|n_M\rangle$ and $|n_\gamma\rangle$ are states of harmonic oscillators characterized by the (conserved) number of excitations n_M and n_γ . They keep their usual normalization and interpretation as providing the quantum state of the oscillators, i.e. the interpretation that one uses when working with quantum matter fields in a classical geometry[16]. This remains true when the states are adiabatically distorted by gravity, see Appendix A.

Then, in order for the coefficients c_{n_M, n_γ} to keep also their interpretation as the probability amplitude to find the matter state in the n_M, n_γ sector, a normalization of the gravitational part of the wave function, $\Psi(a; n_M, n_\gamma)$ must be chosen. This wave satisfies the WDW equation at fixed n_M and n_γ

$$\left[G^2 \partial_a^2 + \kappa a^2 + \Lambda a^4 + 2Ga E_m(n_M, n_\gamma, a) \right] \Psi(a; n_M, n_\gamma) = 0 \quad (23)$$

where $E_m(n_M, n_\gamma, a) = M(n_M + 1/2) + k(n_\gamma + 1/2)/a$ is the eigenvalue of the matter hamiltonian, eq. (12). Our aim is not to provide a new interpretation to $\Psi(a; n_M, n_\gamma)$ nor to discuss the “normal ordering” problem, i.e. to define the operator ∂_a^2 . Instead our aim is to determine (i) how to normalize Ψ in order to be able to interpret the c_{n_M, n_γ} as amplitudes of probability (ii) under which conditions its properties lead to a localization of quantum matter transitions similar to the one used when one works in a background geometry and (iii) what are the origin and the meaning of the corrections to this approximate description. We refer to [1][2][9] for discussions concerning possible interpretations of the solutions of the WDW equation.

We shall prove that the necessary condition to interpret the c_{n_M, n_γ} as amplitudes of probability is that the waves $\Psi(a; n_M, n_\gamma)$ have positive unit (conserved) wronskian, i.e.

$$\Psi^*(a; n_M, n_\gamma) \overleftrightarrow{i\partial_a} \Psi(a; n_M, n_\gamma) = 1 \quad (24)$$

for all n_M, n_γ . When considering the solutions of the Klein-Gordon equation, this condition with t replacing a means, in the absence of pair production, i.e. when the WKB approximation is valid, that one deals with a single particle. Similarly, in the present case, it means that one works with a single universe.

In order to prove that unit wronskian allows that interpretation, we shall not work with the functions $\Psi(a; n_M, n_\gamma)$ directly. Instead we shall work with a kernel of the form $K = \Psi^* \Psi$. The reason for this choice is that matter matrix elements are governed by K and not $\Psi(a; n_M, n_\gamma)$. Indeed, both quantum matter field theory and the gravitational corrections induced by the dynamical character of a will be delivered by the properties of K and not those of Ψ . Furthermore, the choice of unit wronskian is elegantly introduced and justified by gauge invariance when working with K .

Indeed, in strict analogy with the Feynman boundary condition for relativistic particle in the Schwinger formalism[15], one introduces a “fifth” time, here it corresponds to a constant lapse N , and one writes the Schroedinger equation (first order) for the kernel $\tilde{K}(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma; N)$ to propagate from a_2 to a_1 in a time N

$$i\partial_N - \left[G^2 \partial_a^2 + \kappa a^2 + \Lambda a^4 + 2GaE_m(n_M, n_\gamma, a) \right] \tilde{K}(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma; N) = \delta(N) \delta(a_2 - a_1) \quad (25)$$

This N dependent kernel satisfies the usual boundary condition

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{K}(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma; N) = \delta(a_2 - a_1) \quad (26)$$

Then one chooses the integration contour of N . In strict analogy to the Feynman boundary condition, we integrate over positive N only and define

$$K(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma) = G^2 \int_0^\infty dN \tilde{K}(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma; N) \quad (27)$$

where the factor of G^2 has been introduced for further convenience.

We point out two properties of this kernel which arise from the second order character of the WDW equation and the integration over positive N only. First, its normalization automatically leads to positivity unit wronskian, in the following sense

$$\lim_{a_2 - a_1 \rightarrow 0^+} (i\partial_{a_2} - i\partial_{a_1}) K(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma) = 1 \quad (28)$$

Secondly, the “convolution” of two kernels satisfies

$$K(a_3, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma) = K(a_3, a_2; n_M, n_\gamma) \overleftrightarrow{i\partial_{a_2}} K(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma) \quad (29)$$

when $a_3 > a_2 > a_1$. This relation coincides with the convolution in time of the Feynman Green function of a relativistic particle, and not with the convolution of non-relativistic

kernels. The reason for the discrepancy is the additional integration over the “fifth” time N which projects onto zero energy solutions. We shall see in the next Section how these two properties guarantee that quantum matter field theory in a geometrical background will re-appear in a well defined scheme of approximations. In this respect, there is no necessity to provide an interpretation to $K(a_2, a_1)$. To determine how to normalize and to use it is sufficient.

Finally we rewrite this kernel introducing the density matrix of the matter. The reason is to unify the notations for matter Green function together with propagation of gravity. In the case of eq. (27), the density matrices are trivial: $\hat{\rho}_M = |n_M\rangle\langle n_M|$ and $\hat{\rho}_\gamma = |n_\gamma\rangle\langle n_\gamma|$, but the following expression is valid for any density matrix. We express $K(a_2, a_1; \rho_M, \rho_\gamma)$ as

$$K(a_2, a_1; \rho_M, \rho_\gamma) = \tilde{T}r[\hat{\rho}_M \hat{\rho}_\gamma |a_1\rangle\langle a_2|] \quad (30)$$

where the symbol $\tilde{T}r$ means the trace over all matter + gravity configurations such that the WDW constraint is satisfied by integration over positive N .

To get some flavor of what is the physical meaning of the “Feynman” boundary condition in the present case, it is appropriate to consider the the WKB approximation. In this approximation, the kernel is equal to

$$K(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma) = \frac{\exp\left(i \int_{a_1}^{a_2} \pi(a, n_M, n_\gamma) da\right)}{2\sqrt{\pi(a_2, n_M, n_\gamma)\pi(a_1, n_M, n_\gamma)}} = \Psi_{WKB}(a_2; n_M, n_\gamma) \Psi_{WKB}^*(a_1; n_M, n_\gamma) \quad (31)$$

where the momentum $\pi(a, n_M, n_\gamma)$ is given in eq. (16), and where $\Psi_{WKB}(a; n_M, n_\gamma)$ is the WKB solution of eq. (23) with unit wronskian. Therefore in that approximation, one has monotonic expansion when $a_2 > a_1$ if the classical momentum π_a does not vanish. Then, “negative energy” solutions, with $\pi > 0$, are not generated since there is no back-scattering in the WKB approximation. Upon considering matter interactions in [20], negative energy solutions might be produced. We refer to that paper for a discussion of this point.

In Section 5, we shall evaluate the corrections to the WKB approximation. For the moment, we just recall that its validity requires, see *e.g.* [16], that

$$\partial_a \pi(a, n_M, n_\gamma) \ll \pi^2(a, n_M, n_\gamma) \quad (32)$$

The reason for which we recall this criterion is the following: we want to *compare* the implications of eq. (32) and eq. (8). To this end we introduce the dimensionless quantity N_s , given by $N_s(a) = 2GE_m(n_M, n_\gamma, a)/a$ which may be understood as the “Schwarzschild radius” of the matter content of the universe measured in the unit of a . For a closed universe, one has $N_s = 1$ at its turning point. More generally, in (non-empty) cosmology, one is confronted with “huge” numbers, i.e. numbers whose logarithm are much bigger than one, as well as large numbers, i.e. numbers whose logarithm are bigger but close to one. What we want to stress is that N_s belongs to the second class. (We shall consider separately the de Sitter case.) Thus upon dealing with “huge” numbers, like n_M , one can put, in a first approximation, $N_s = 1$ and trade therefore a for the total *matter* content of the universe.

To see how this works, consider a matter dominated universe with $N_s(a) = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and with $N_s(a) \gg \Lambda a^2$. Then, the condition that the Hubble radius be much bigger than the Compton wave length, eq. (8), leads to a constraint on n_M , the number of massive quanta,

$$n_M \gg \frac{\hbar}{GM^2} = \frac{\mu_{Planck}^2}{M^2} \gg 1 \quad (33)$$

Indeed one has $(\dot{a}/a)^2 \simeq GMn_M/a^3 \simeq (GMn_M)^{-2}$ when $N_s = \mathcal{O}(1)$. The last inequality in eq. (33) simply recalls that M must be much smaller than the Planck mass μ_{Planck} in order to legitimize the neglect of the gravitational dressing of *individual* quanta. This requirement has nothing to do with the semi-classical of the propagation of the cosmological radius a . In this respect, it should be pointed out that the condition (33), is not compatible with the limit $G \rightarrow 0$ which is used in refs. [5][12][13] to define the background solution. This is related to the fact that we shall find, in contradiction to these works, that the background solution is driven by the mean matter energy.

Using the same substitutions, eq. (32), gives

$$n_M \gg \frac{\mu_{Planck}}{M} \quad (34)$$

When eq. (33) is satisfied, eq. (32) is fulfilled. This simply means that when the Hubble radius $a/\dot{a}$ is much bigger than the Compton wave length, matter dominated universes behave semi-classically. We emphasize this point: the validity of the WKB approximation for a puts constraints on the *sources* of gravity, i.e. on matter. Furthermore, this hierarchy of constraints on n_M determines the *relative* importance of the corrections on the various approximations that we shall perform in the next section. This will be made explicit in Section 5.

4 Green functions from WDW solutions

To construct Green functions from the solutions of the WDW equation, we shall proceed in two steps. First, we work in the background field approximation, i.e. we evaluate the Green functions of ψ and ϕ from their time dependence in a classical universe whose radius follows $a = a(t)$. Secondly, we define an extension of these Green functions in the WDW framework and show under which conditions the quantum matter-gravity evolution leads to the expressions previously obtained.

In a classical universe whose radius is given, once for all, by $a = a(t)$, the Green functions of the ψ field are defined in total analogy with eq. (3), by

$$G_\psi(t_2, t_1) = \langle \chi_0 | \psi(t_2) \psi(t_1) | \chi_0 \rangle \quad (35)$$

where $|\chi_0\rangle$ is the state of the ψ field. When the state of the field is described by a diagonal density matrix, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} G_\psi^{\rho_M}(t_2, t_1) &= Tr_\psi[\hat{\rho}_M \psi(t_2) \psi(t_1)] = \Sigma_{n_M} \rho_{n_M} G_\psi^{n_M}(t_2 - t_1) \\ &= \Sigma_{n_M} \rho_{n_M} \frac{1}{2M} \left(n_M e^{iM(t_2-t_1)} + (n_M + 1) e^{-iM(t_2-t_1)} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where the symbol Tr_ψ has been introduced to be used in concordance with eq. (30). It means “trace over the ψ configurations”. The last equality follows from the fact that the ψ field is an harmonic oscillator of frequency M for all cosmological histories described by $a(t)$, see eqs. (5, 7). For the ϕ field instead, one gets

$$G_\phi^{\rho_\gamma}(t_2, t_1; k) = \Sigma_{n_\gamma} \rho_{n_\gamma} \frac{1}{2k} \left(n_\gamma e^{ik(\eta_2 - \eta_1)} + (n_\gamma + 1) e^{-ik(\eta_2 - \eta_1)} \right) \quad (37)$$

where the lapse of conformal time is defined by $\eta_2 - \eta_1 = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt/a(t)$.

We now define a matrix element which generalizes eq. (36) in the WDW framework. In this case as well, we have to specify the matter content of the universe, i.e. the weights $\rho_{n_M}, \rho_{n_\gamma}$. However we shall see that the matter content will now play a *double* role, the former one appearing in eq. (36) and the one of eq. (17) which determines the time lapse as a function of a_2 and a_1 .

Using the notation presented in eqs. (30, 36), we define $\mathcal{G}_\psi^\rho(a_2, a_1)$ to be

$$\mathcal{G}_\psi^{\rho_\gamma}(a_2, a_1) = \tilde{T}r \left[\hat{\rho}_M \hat{\rho}_\gamma \left(|a_2\rangle i\overleftrightarrow{\partial}_{a_2} \psi \langle a_2| \right) \left(|a_1\rangle i\overleftrightarrow{\partial}_{a_1} \psi \langle a_1| \right) \right] \quad (38)$$

The operator ψ is the Schroedinger operator $= (d_M + d_M^\dagger)/\sqrt{2M}$. Then the operator $|a_2\rangle i\overleftrightarrow{\partial}_{a_2} \psi \langle a_2|$ should be read “ ψ at $a = a_2$ ”. It replaces exactly the Heisenberg operator $\psi(t_2)$ in eq. (36) which is “ ψ at $t = t_2$ ”. The occurrence of the operator $2\pi_{a_2} = i\overleftrightarrow{\partial}_{a_2}$ follows from the second order character of the propagation of a , see the discussion after eq. (27). We shall see that this operator guarantees that the weight attributed to “to be at $a = a_2$ ” does not depend on the momentum π_a at a_2 , hence “to be at $a = a_2$ ” is independent of the matter content of the universe³ i.e. independent of n_M, n_γ . This independence is required in order to interpret the matrices $\hat{\rho}$ of eq. (38) as providing the *probability* to find the system characterized by n_M, n_γ , being at $a = a_2$.

In terms of the kernel at fixed matter content, see eq. (27), one gets

$$\mathcal{G}_\psi^\rho(a_2, a_1) = \Sigma_{n_M, n_\gamma} \rho_{n_M} \rho_{n_\gamma} \left[\frac{n_M}{2M} K(a_2, a_1; n_M - 1, n_\gamma) + \frac{n_M + 1}{2M} K(a_2, a_1; n_M + 1, n_\gamma) \right] i\overleftrightarrow{\partial}_{a_2} i\overleftrightarrow{\partial}_{a_1} K(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma) \quad (39)$$

where the two terms come, as in eq. (5), from the products $d_M^\dagger d_M$ and the $d_M d_M^\dagger$ which decrease and increase respectively the number of massive quanta by *one* unit.

³ The origin of this operator $2\pi_a$ can also be understood as follows. Green functions are densities with respect to t (or a) since both are continuous variables. This means that Green functions enter into physical rates of transitions integrated over t (or a). Therefore instead of considering $G_\psi^\rho(t_2, t_1)$ one might consider $G_\psi^\rho(t_2, t_1) dt_2 dt_1$ directly. Then, the corresponding quantity in quantum cosmology becomes $\mathcal{G}_\psi^{\rho_\gamma}(a_2, a_1) da_2 da_1 / \pi_{a_2} \pi_{a_1}$ and the extra factors of π_a^{-1} cancel with the previous ones. Upon considering *interactions*, it is the hamiltonian framework which specifies the weight accompanying Green functions in transition probabilities, and indeed one finds that unit wronskian is required[20]. However extra factor of $1/\sqrt{2|\pi_a|}$ will still be found at the end points of the amplitudes. Their amputation is mandatory in order to obtain amplitudes of *probability*, as in the reduction formula.

Since n_M and n_γ are strictly conserved, $\mathcal{G}^\rho$ decomposes as

$$\mathcal{G}_\psi^\rho(a_2, a_1) = \sum_{n_M, n_\gamma} \rho_{n_M} \rho_{n_\gamma} \mathcal{G}_\psi^{n_M, n_\gamma}(a_2, a_1) \quad (40)$$

where $\mathcal{G}_\psi^{n_M, n_\gamma}(a_2, a_1)$ is the Green function in a universe with exactly n_M and n_γ quanta. This is our first result.

We now proceed to a *double* development. First, we use the WKB expression for $K(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma)$, eq. (31), and we obtain (compare with eq. (5))

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_\psi^{n_M, n_\gamma}(a_2, a_1) &= \frac{n_M}{2M} A_- e^{-i \int_{a_1}^{a_2} [\pi(a, n_M, n_\gamma) - \pi(a, n_M - 1, n_\gamma)] da} \\ &\quad + \frac{n_M + 1}{2M} A_+ e^{-i \int_{a_1}^{a_2} [\pi(a, n_M, n_\gamma) - \pi(a, n_M + 1, n_\gamma)] da} \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where $\pi(a, n_M, n_\gamma)$ is the classical momentum, solution of eq. (16), and where the normalization factors $A_\pm$ are given by

$$A_\pm = \frac{1}{4} \frac{[\pi(a_1, n_M, n_\gamma) + \pi(a_1, n_M \pm 1, n_\gamma)] [\pi(a_2, n_M, n_\gamma) + \pi(a_2, n_M \pm 1, n_\gamma)]}{[\pi(a_1, n_M, n_\gamma) \pi(a_2, n_M, n_\gamma) \pi(a_1, n_M \pm 1, n_\gamma) \pi(a_2, n_M \pm 1, n_\gamma)]^{1/2}} \quad (42)$$

Secondly, we develop the phase and the norm of $\mathcal{G}_\psi$ to first order in the *change* of the matter energy ($= M$), that is to the zeroth order in $1/n_M$. Using Hamilton-Jacobi relation, the phase can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{a_1}^{a_2} [\pi(a, n_M, n_\gamma) - \pi(a, n_M - 1, n_\gamma)] da &= \partial_{n_M} \int_{a_1}^{a_2} \pi(a, n_M, n_\gamma) da + \mathcal{O}(1/n_M) \\ &= -M \Delta t(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma) + \mathcal{O}(1/n_M) \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

by definition of $\Delta t(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma)$, c.f. eq. (17). To this order in $1/n_M$, one finds that the norm $A_\pm = 1$, for all n_M, n_γ . This is the necessary condition mentioned above. The gravitational propagation must be normalized in such a way that it gives a unit weight to the matter matrix elements, at least to this order in $1/n_M$.

Collecting the results, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_\psi^{n_M, n_\gamma}(a_2, a_1) &= \frac{1}{2M} \left(n_M e^{iM \Delta t(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma)} + (n_M + 1) e^{-iM \Delta t(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma)} \right) \\ &= G_\psi^{n_M}(\Delta t(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma)) \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

see eq. (36).

Therefore, we have proven that to first order in the change in the matter energy and to the WKB approximation of the kernels for gravity, $\mathcal{G}_\psi^{n_M, n_\gamma}(a_2, a_1)$, defined in eq. (38), is *equal* to the Green function $G_\psi^{n_M}(\Delta t(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma))$ evaluated in *the* universe characterized by n_M and n_γ . This is our second result. From eq. (41), we see that the sole role of the product of the two normalized kernels $K(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma)$ is to provide the phase of the Green function $G_\psi^{n_M}(\Delta t(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma))$.

The double dependence in n_M , that we mentioned after eq. (37), is now manifest. As in eqs. (5, 36), there is the usual “harmonic” dependence of the norm in the number

of quanta under examination, *i.e.* those of the ψ field, but there is also the *parametric* dependence of the lapse of proper time $\Delta t(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma)$ in the total number of quanta of all species that are present in the universe. For exactly the same reason, *i.e.* the dynamical character of gravity, a double dependence of the temperature in the occupation numbers is also found upon considering statistical mechanics in the presence of gravity, see the discussion after eq. (25) in [18].

We emphasize that the quantity appearing in the Green functions, *i.e.* $M\Delta t = \partial_n \int da \pi_a$ is gauge independent. Indeed, it gives the number of nodes of the Compton frequency M^{-1} from a_2 to a_1 in a universe filled with n_M and n_γ quanta. The reason which guarantees this gauge invariance is that (i) the “entries” of the kernels $K(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma)$ are the gauge independent quantities a , n_M and n_γ , (ii) the Green functions are determined in terms of variations of K with respect to these quantities.

We also emphasize that the decomposition in eq. (40) requires only the existence of conserved quantities, in our case n_M and n_γ ⁴. No other approximation is needed. Eq. (40) is essential in guaranteeing that the background geometry, from which time lapses are defined, is the one characterized by these quantum numbers. In this we confirm and generalize [6][9][10] and disagree with [5][11][12][13]. Indeed there is no reason to develop eq. (43) around $n_M = 1, n_\gamma = 0$. It is this procedure which is (implicitly) adopted in those works by taking the limit $G \rightarrow 0$ in eq. (23).

In this respect, it is very instructive to compare the parallel development which leads to a canonical distribution for a little system contained in a much bigger isolated ensemble. First, one realizes that the action of the cosmological expansion, eq. (21), acts like the entropy of a reservoir in delivering the time lapse. Indeed, a heat reservoir determines the (inverse) temperature through a first order energy change of its entropy, compare eq. (43) and eq. (64) in Appendix B. Secondly, upon considering second order energy changes, the analogy is maintained and reinforced since the corrections to the background field approximation are similar to the finite size effects of a big isolated system, see Section 5. Thirdly, the additive character of the energy implies that two different massive fields evolve with the same proper time. Indeed, to first order in the energy changes, the derivative of eq. (43) would determine the same time lapse for both fields. This is exactly like the “zero-th law” of thermodynamics (*i.e.* the equality of the temperatures at equilibrium) which follows in a microcanonical ensemble from the additivity of the energy and the equipartition ansatz.

Before proceeding to the evaluation of the corrections and exploring the correlated nature of both approximations used, three important remarks should be added.

1. Had we studied the corresponding Green function for the massless conformally coupled field ϕ , we would have obtained

$$\mathcal{G}_\phi^{n_M, n_\gamma}(a_2, a_1; k) = \frac{1}{2k} \left(n_\gamma e^{ik\Delta\eta(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma)} + (n_\gamma + 1) e^{-ik\Delta\eta(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma)} \right) \quad (45)$$

instead of eq. (44). This is because the gravitational phase in the WKB approximation

⁴ We shall relax the constraint on the Hubble radius, eq. (8), in [21] and consider pair creation of massive quanta. Then exactly conserved quantities will be replaced by adiabatically conserved quantities.

is governed by the change of $\int \pi da$ with respect of n_γ :

$$\partial_{n_\gamma} \int_{a_1}^{a_2} \pi(a, n_M, n_\gamma) da = -k \Delta\eta(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma) \quad (46)$$

by definition of $\Delta\eta(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma)$, see eq. (18). Thus, the response of gravity, that is the first order change of $\int da \pi(a, n_M, n_\gamma)$ induced by the operators ψ or ϕ , furnishes (by definition) the correct time dependence through Hamilton-Jacobi equations.

2. Eq. (40) tells us that the Green function is given by the weighted sum of Green functions at fixed n_M, n_γ . Therefore one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_\psi^\rho(a_2, a_1) &= \sum_{n_M, n_\gamma} \rho_{n_M} \rho_{n_\gamma} G_\psi^{n_M}(\Delta t(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma)) \\ &= \sum_{n_M} \rho_{n_M} G_\psi^{n_M}(\Delta t(a_2, a_1; \bar{n}_M, \bar{n}_\gamma)) = G_\psi^{\rho_M}(\bar{\Delta} t(a_2, a_1)) \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where $\bar{n}_M, \bar{n}_\gamma$ are the mean number of massive and massless quanta and where the mean lapse $\bar{\Delta} t(a_2, a_1)$ is equal to $\Delta t(a_2, a_1; \bar{n}_M, \bar{n}_\gamma)$. In the second equality, we have replaced the *parametric* dependence of $\mathcal{G}$ through $\Delta t(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma)$ in n_M and n_γ by a single “background” contribution controlled by the mean occupation numbers. This is physically relevant for well peaked distributions, i.e. for $\langle (\Delta n)^2 \rangle / \langle n^2 \rangle \ll 1$. In that case, the Green functions $\mathcal{G}$ are correctly given in terms of the properties of the *mean* universe only. This mean universe is the solution of Einstein equations driven by the mean energy density [7][9][10] (the so-called semi-classical equations). In our case, it is determined by, see eq. (14),

$$\begin{aligned} H_G + \langle H_m \rangle &= 0 \\ -\frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} + \frac{\kappa}{a^2} + \Lambda + \frac{2G}{a^3} \left(M \bar{n}_M + \frac{k}{a} \bar{n}_\gamma \right) &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where $\dot{a}$ means $\partial_t a$, i.e. derivative with respect to the mean proper time.

Instead, for widely spread distributions, it is no longer meaningful to define a mean universe governing mean lapses because remote matter field configurations will classically evolve differently and quantum mechanically will never interfere. However this is free of consequences since *each* contribution at fixed n_M, n_γ delivers a well defined time dependence to Green functions. We shall return to these “decoherence” aspects upon considering interactions, in [20].

3. We stress that eq. (41) delivers the Green function in the Schroedinger picture, see eq. (5). We now understand that the double dependence on n_M and the parametric dependence in n_γ lead to non-linearities which prevent to define an Heisenberg operator $\psi(a)$ from H_M only. On the contrary, the superposition principle still survives for the Schroedinger evolution of the full wave function, here given by $K(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma)$.

5 The gravitational corrections to Green functions

There are three types of corrections associated with the three approximations used. First there are the nonlinear terms in the change of the matter energy induced by the

operators ψ , see the passage from eq. (41) to eq. (44). Then one has the corrections to the WKB approximation used when replacing the kernels in eq. (39) by their WKB expression given in eq. (41). Finally one has the corrections associated with the spread in n_M and n_γ upon computing the Green function in the mean universe, see eq. (47). The first two are of dynamical character while the third one depends of the choice of the state of matter, i.e. the spread in $\hat{\rho}_M$ and $\hat{\rho}_\gamma$. Our aim is to determine what are the dominant and hence relevant corrections.

These three corrections make explicit the non-linearities induced by the dynamical character of gravity. In particular, the approximate nature of the background is displayed and its sensitivity on the quantum transition under examination is pointed out.

We start by evaluating the non linear corrections in the energy change which arise in the phase and the norm of eq. (41). To second order in the energy change, the phase of the first term gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{a_1}^{a_2} [\pi(a, n_M, n_\gamma) - \pi(a, n_M - 1, n_\gamma)] da = \\ & \int_{a_1}^{a_2} \left[\frac{aM}{G\pi(a, n_M, n_\gamma)} \left(1 - \frac{aM}{G\pi^2(a, n_M, n_\gamma)} \right) \right] da \simeq \\ & -M\Delta t(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma) \left[1 - \frac{a_1 M}{G\pi^2(a_1, n_M, n_\gamma)} \left(1 + \Delta t \left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a} - \frac{2\dot{\pi}}{\pi} \right) \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Notice that we have developed the expression around n_M and not around the “mean” value $n_M - 1/2$. We have developed around n_M since we want to use the same background for both terms of eq. (41).

In the third line we have replaced the integral of the correction by the value of the integrand at a_1 times the interval plus the linear dependence in Δt . This is valid if a/π^2 is slowly varying. To estimate these terms, one should specify the dominant matter content of the universe. When the universe is matter dominated, the first correction term is

$$\frac{a_1 M}{G\pi^2(a_1, n_M, n_\gamma)} \simeq \frac{M}{2Mn_M + 2kn_\gamma/a} < \frac{1}{2n_M} \quad (50)$$

It is independent of G , $\hbar$ and a . It depends only on the ratio of the matter change ($= M$) and the total energy in the universe. This is what guarantees the validity of the background field approximation: that the *sources* of gravity in the universe be heavy⁵ when compared to the transition upon examination. This is our third result.

The origin and the meaning of this term are clear. It arises from our choice to develop eq. (49) around n_M and not around the “mean” value $n_M - 1/2$. Indeed, had one developed around the “mean” value, it would not be present. Its meaning is therefore that each term of eq. (41) defines its own background. This dependence of the background in the quantum event under examination will be further discussed in [20].

As already pointed out in Section 4, there is a close correspondence between the present development of the gravitational action and the development of the entropy of

⁵As pointed out by R. Brout upon discussing these results, the emergence of an inertial time delivered by the matter content of the universe can be viewed as rephrasing (and legitimizing) Mach’s principle in this quantum context.

a big isolated system around equilibrium. Compare eq. (49) and eq. (67) in Appendix B. We reemphasize that both first order and second order energy changes are in strict correspondence. Indeed, first order changes determine time and inverse temperature and second order changes determine the corrections to these background-equilibrium concepts.

We emphasize that the Planck length does not appear in this correction and we point out that this correction has the same origin as the recoil effect of a relativistic particle affected by a transition[19]. In that case the correction term⁶ is $\omega/2M$ where ω is the energy of the emitted photon and M the rest mass of the particle, more on this can be found in [20].

When the universe is radiation dominated, this correction term is $aM/n_\gamma k$ which is smaller than $1/n_M$ and independent of G as well. When the universe is de Sitter dominated, the correction is $GM/\Lambda a^3 (<< 1/n_M$ by hypothesis).

The second correction term of eq. (49) is quadratic in Δt . It scales like the first correction term multiplied by $\Delta t(\dot{a}/a)$. Therefore as long as Δt is of the order of a few Compton wave lengths this second term is much smaller than the first one by virtue of eq. (8). By a similar analysis, one easily shows that the norm factors $A_\pm$, eq. (42) are given by $(1 + 1/n_M^2 \mathcal{O}(1))$.

Therefore, for macroscopic universe characterized by $n_M \gg 1$, the non linear terms engendered by the change in energy carried by the operators ψ can be correctly and safely discarded. Furthermore, the dominant correction comes from the desire of working with a *single* background characterized by the initial number of quanta n_M hence valid for both terms of the Green function.

We now compute the corrections to the WKB approximation. We recall that we used this approximation in order to evaluate the kernels of gravity $K(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma)$, see eq. (31). Very important is the fact that $\mathcal{G}$ is given in term of products of two kernels, see eq. (39). Indeed only a small part of the correction to the K 's will therefore affect the Green functions.

As explained in [16], the first order correction to the WKB approximation is obtained by replacing $\pi(a, n_M, n_\gamma) = \pi_{cl}$ by

$$\tilde{\pi}(a, n_M, n_\gamma) = \pi_{cl} \left(1 + \frac{\hbar^2}{4} \left[\frac{3\partial_a \pi_{cl}^2}{2\pi_{cl}^4} - \frac{\partial_a^2 \pi_{cl}}{\pi_{cl}^3} \right] \right) \quad (51)$$

As before, one has to specify the matter content of the universe to evaluate the modification of the phase and the norm of $\mathcal{G}$ induced by this correction. When the universe is matter dominated, the modification of phase of the Green function induced by the second term of eq. (51) is, see eq. (49),

$$-M\Delta t(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma) \left(\frac{\mu_{Planck}^4}{M^4} \frac{1}{n_M^4} \mathcal{O}(1) \right) \ll -M\Delta t(a_2, a_1; n_M, n_\gamma) \left(\frac{1}{n_M^2} \right) \quad (52)$$

⁶In this respect, it is instructive to compare the perturbative treatments of [12] and [19] which are both applied to a relativistic particle. Each treatment is closely related to the corresponding one in quantum cosmology. In [12], the development is made around zero momentum (this corresponds to isolate empty Einstein solutions) whereas in [19] the development is made around the *change* in the momentum induced by a given transition. This latter clearly corresponds to what was done in eq. (49).

where we have used eq. (34). This means that when eq. (8) is satisfied, the universe behaves so semiclassically that the part of the correction to the WKB approximation which modifies the Green function is *irrelevant* since it is smaller than the non-linear corrections of eq. (50) by an extra factor of $1/n_M$.

Similarly, the change of the phase of the Green function associated with a different choice of the “normal ordering” of the operator ∂_a^2 in eq. (23) is equally irrelevant. Indeed another choice in defining ∂_a^2 would lead to an additional quantum potential term which would induce a change in eq. (49) through a change in the momentum π_a of the same order of the WKB corrections given in eq. (51).

In both cases, the relevant part of the corrections is given by the *change* of the correction obtained by comparing two neighbouring solutions characterized by n_M and $n_M - 1$. Indeed both the phase and the norm of $\mathcal{G}$ are given in terms of the difference $\pi(a, n_M, n_\gamma) - \pi(a, n_M - 1, n_\gamma)$. This is why small corrections are obtained and why we emphasize the necessity of the *double* development. As in eq. (50), it is the weight of the *sources* of gravity which guarantees the negligible character of these corrections.

The third kind of corrections are associated with the spread of n_M, n_γ specified by the choice of the matrices ρ_M, ρ_γ . To estimate these corrections and to compare them with the first kind just described, we write the mean quadratic spread as $(\bar{\Delta}n_M)^2 = n_M\sigma_M$ and similarly for $\bar{\Delta}n_\gamma$. Then by repeating the algebra of eq. (49), one verifies that the change in the phase is controlled by the factor $1 + \sigma_M^2/\bar{n}_M^2\mathcal{O}(1)$. This result was obtained in [10]. Similarly, the prefactor of $\mathcal{G}$ is multiplied by $1 + iM\Delta t\sigma_M/\bar{n}_M$. Thus for sufficiently small time intervals, the corrections induced by the spread are negligible for $n_M \gg 1$ and $\sigma_M = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Note however that the “1” in the factor $n_M + 1$ which appears in the mean Green function defined in eq. (47) is meaningful only if $M\Delta t\sigma_M \ll 1$.

Had we worked with a universe described by a pure state instead of a diagonal density matrix, we would have obtained the additional interfering terms of eq. (6). This interfering term is more sensitive to gravitational corrections. Indeed, for $t_2 + t_1 - 2t_0$ large compare to $\bar{n}_M/\sigma_M$, the phase shifts due to the non-linearities introduce additional phases which will lead to the vanishing of that term upon summing over n_M and n_γ . Therefore, the backreaction of gravity, i.e. the dependence of the time intervals in the particle content of the universe (which is represented by these non linear terms), leads inevitably to decoherence for sufficiently long time intervals. All of this is valid for well peaked distribution of energy around their mean values. For wider spreads, the decoherence effects are even stronger. We shall return to this point after have considered the interactions in [20]. Let us just mention that the interactions among matter and radiation will inevitably engender spreads in n_γ proportional to n_M . Therefore density matrices which are initially too peaked will spread dynamically. Spreads in energy are intrinsic to cosmology.

Finally we stress that up to now the insertion of the field operators at some radius has been performed from the outset as if one had an *additional* quantum system coupled to the field at that radius. However such an additional system carries some mass-energy which must be taken into account in the total matter hamiltonian. It will therefore affect gravity. To show how to treat the interactions of the *internal* constituents of the

universe is the purpose of [20].

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank R. Brout for three years of intense discussions on the aspects developed in this paper, as well as for useful comments concerning a first draft of this paper. I am grateful to R. Balbinot, Cl. Bouchiat, J. Iliopoulos, S. Massar, Ph. Spindel and G. Venturi for useful remarks. I wish also to thank the group of the CNRS center of Marseille-Luminy for an invitation during which various aspects of this work were discussed.

6 Appendix A. Green functions with non-vanishing momenta

In this Appendix we introduce an extension of the formalism in which the momenta of matter no longer vanish. This extension allows to compare the manner by which the notion of spatial displacement arises from homogeneous solutions to the manner we used to recover time lapses from stationary solutions. Furthermore, when dealing with homogeneous universes, this extension makes explicit the appearance of inertial coordinates as the “angles” conjugated to the conserved momenta, i.e. the “actions”. Finally, the dynamical character of gravity, i.e. the backreaction, breaks the symmetry between the local representation and the momentum representation which exists when quantum field theory is considered in the absence of gravity. Indeed, gravity responds to the conserved momenta. This implies that the local representation is an approximate description which can only be defined a posteriori.

Upon considering non-homogeneous gravitational and matter fields one has to deal with a set of four local constraints $\mathcal{H}^\mu(x) = 0$ in the place of the single scalar constraint, eq. (14). These local constraints are enforced by four Lagrange field-multipliers, $N^\mu(x)$, the local lapse and the local shifts. Up to now, these constraints have only been taken into account partially. For instance, in [6], the action of gravity and matter have been developed to quadratic order only. This leads to a hierarchy of constraints. Indeed, to that order in the fluctuations around an homogeneous background, the non-homogeneous part of the constraints $\mathcal{H}^\mu(x)$ is *linear* in the fluctuations of matter and gravitational configurations. Instead, the homogeneous parts of the temporal constraint, H , i.e. the zero momentum component of $\mathcal{H}^0(x)$, is quadratic in these fluctuations. The reason is very simple, the non-homogeneous parts of the Lagrange multipliers, $N^\mu(x)$, have no “background” contribution; only the zero momentum component of $N^0(x)$, i.e. N , has such.

This has an important consequence for us. Upon dealing around an homogeneous background with matter fluctuations which leads to *quadratic* contributions in $\mathcal{H}^\mu(x)$, one has to work without gravitational fluctuations if one develops the gravitational fluctuations in the action to quadratic order only. Accordingly, one should ignore completely the inhomogeneous part of the constraints. This quadratic approximation means that the

matter quanta do not interact directly among themselves. However they do contribute to the homogeneous background energy.

We shall work in this framework. The action of our massive field is now

$$S_M = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3p \, dt \left(\dot{\psi}_p^2 - (M^2 + \frac{p^2}{a(t)^2}) \psi_p^2 \right) \quad (53)$$

where the dimensionless quantity p is the conserved number of nodes of the field fluctuation. For closed three surfaces, p is an integer number. At this level, this action can be envisaged as describing a collection of homogeneous excitations characterized by the a dependent energy

$$\Omega(p, a) = \sqrt{M^2 + p^2/a^2} \quad (54)$$

Similarly the action of the massless conformally coupled field is

$$S_\gamma = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3k \, d\eta \left((\partial_\eta \phi_k)^2 - k^2 \phi_k^2 \right) = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3k \, \frac{dt}{a} \left(a^2 \dot{\phi}_k^2 - k^2 \phi_k^2 \right) \quad (55)$$

We can then proceed as in Section 3. The energy of gravity must annihilate the a -dependent total energy of the matter:

$$H_G + H_m = \left(\frac{-G^2 \pi_a + \kappa a^2 + \Lambda a^4}{2Ga} \right) + \left(\int d^3p \, n(M, p) \Omega(p, a) + \int d^3k \, n(\gamma, k) \frac{k}{a} \right) = 0 \quad (56)$$

Notice that the subtraction of the zero-point energy is now mandatory since we have an infinity of fluctuating modes. We emphasize that, being conserved quantities, p and k are gauge invariant quantities. Therefore, upon making variations of the gravitational kernel with respect to them, one shall define gauge invariant quantities as well. In particular, their conjugate variables are “angles”, i.e. they do not appear in the Hamilton-Jacobi equation. This is how inertial coordinates are introduced and legitimized in the hamiltonian framework. Furthermore, we treat $n(M, p)$ as constants of motion as well, i.e. we work in the adiabatic approximation. This is valid if eq. (8) is satisfied. Therefore, the total wave function can be expressed, as in eq. (22), as a sum of waves at fixed particle number $n(M, p), n(\gamma, k)$. The same is true for the kernel $K(a_2, a_1; n(M, p), n(\gamma, k))$ defined as in eq. (27). Then we can define the “WDW” Green function at fixed p in a universe characterized by the set of occupation numbers $n(M, p'), n(\gamma, k)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_\psi^{n(M, p'), n(\gamma, k)}(p, a_2, a_1) &= \tilde{T}r \left[\hat{\rho}_{n(M, p')} \hat{\rho}_{n(\gamma, k)} \left(|a_2\rangle i \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_{a_2} \psi_p \langle a_2| \right) \left(|a_1\rangle i \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_{a_1} \psi_p \langle a_1| \right) \right] \\ &= \left[\frac{n(M, p)}{2\sqrt{\Omega(p, a_1)\Omega(p, a_2)}} K(a_2, a_1; n(M, p) - 1, n(M, p' \neq p), n(\gamma, k)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{n(M, p) + 1}{2\sqrt{\Omega(p, a_1)\Omega(p, a_2)}} K(a_2, a_1; n(M, p) + 1, n(M, p' \neq p), n(\gamma, k)) \right] \\ &\quad i \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_{a_2} i \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_{a_1} K(a_2, a_1; n(M, p'), n(\gamma, k)) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where the derivatives act on the kernels only.

Upon using the WKB expressions for the kernels K and to first order in the change in energy, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_\psi^{n(M,p'),n(\gamma,k)}(p, a_2, a_1) &= \frac{n(M, p) e^{i \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt' \Omega(p, a(t'))}}{2\sqrt{\Omega(p, a_1)\Omega(p, a_2)}} + \frac{(n(M, p) + 1) e^{-i \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt' \Omega(p, a(t'))}}{2\sqrt{\Omega(p, a_1)\Omega(p, a_2)}} \\ &= G_\psi^{n(M,p)}[p, \Delta t(a_2, a_1; n(M, p'), n(\gamma, k))] \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

where $G_\psi^{n(M,p')}[p, \Delta t(a_2, a_1; n(M, p'), n(\gamma, k))]$ is the Green function evaluated in a universe whose particle content is determined by the $n(M, p'), n(\gamma, k)$.

We are now in position to determine to what extent one recovers the usual local representation. One first introduces x , the conjugated to the wave number p , by defining the (local) field operator $\psi(x) = \int d^3p e^{ipx} \psi_p$. Then the Green function of these operators is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_\psi^{n(M,p'),n(\gamma,k)}(x_2, x_1, a_2, a_1) &= \tilde{Tr} \left[\hat{\rho}_{n(M,p')} \hat{\rho}_{n(\gamma,k)} |a_2\rangle i \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_{a_2} \psi(x_2) \langle a_2| |a_1\rangle i \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_{a_1} \psi(x_1) \langle a_1| \right] \\ &= \int d^3p e^{ip(x_2-x_1)} \mathcal{G}_\psi^{n(M,p'),n(\gamma,k)}(p, a_2, a_1) \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

It is a function of $x_2 - x_1$ only since p is a conserved quantum number. However it is not a Lorenz invariant function since the cosmological radius is a time dependent function.

The validity of the local representation depends on the space-time separation of the two field insertions at a_1, x_1 and a_2, x_2 . Indeed, the momenta which furnish the dominant (saddle point) contribution to $\mathcal{G}_\psi^{n(M,p'),n(\gamma,k)}(x_2, x_1, a_2, a_1)$ are centered around the solution of

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta x &= \partial_p \int_{a_1}^{a_2} da [\pi(a, n(M, p'), n(\gamma, k)) - \pi(a, n(M, p) - 1, n(M, p' \neq p), n(\gamma, k))] \\ &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \partial_p \Omega(p, a) [1 + \mathcal{O}(p/n_M M)] \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Therefore the correction term is negligible only if the two points are not too close to the light cone defined by $\Delta x = \Delta \eta(a_2, a_1; n(M, p'), n(\gamma, k))$ and reached in the limit $p \rightarrow \infty$. To compute the value of a massive Green function in quantum gravity *on the light cone* is meaningless since the “recoil” of gravity destroys the background.

The lessons of this Appendix are the following

1- There is a regime in which it is legitimate to keep only the constraint eq. (56) and the dispersion relation eq. (54) of individual quanta. This regime correspond to homogeneous background driven by incoherent matter quanta, i.e. the state of the matter is such that the expectation value of the momentum operator $\mathcal{H}_{matter}^i(x)$ vanishes.

2- In that regime, gravity is only sensitive to the various occupation numbers $n(M, p)$ weighted by $\Omega(p, a)$. Therefore, all matter quantities are evaluated in the momentum representation, at fixed p . Only then, one may introduce, by Fourier transform, local representations of these quantities since the reaction of gravity is a nonlinear function of $n(M, p)$ and $\Omega(p, a)$.

3- The local representation is inevitably an approximation. Indeed, in order to localize with arbitrary precision one needs to include arbitrary momenta and thus arbitrary energies. But the equality between the WDW Green function $\mathcal{G}_\psi^{n(M,p'),n(\gamma,k)}(p, a_2, a_1)$ and the corresponding Green function evaluated in the background requires that the exchanged energy $\Omega(p, a)$ be much smaller than the background energy⁷. Thus the localizability of an event is limited in time and in space by this restriction on the exchanged energy. Therefore, exactly like the fact that the time lapse is an approximate concept, it appears that spatial displacements $x_2 - x_1$ have a secondary approximative status. The distance is a useful concept which can be introduced for convenience, a *maquillage* to use the word of Banks[5]. This latter aspect will become more clear upon considering, in the next paper[20], the interactions of an heavy particle and the recoils induced by emissions of light quanta. Indeed, without interactions, there is no physical justification to introduce the local operator $\psi(x) = \int d^3p e^{ipx} \psi_p$.

7 Appendix B. The corrections in v/V in a micro-canonical ensemble

In the Appendix we shall compute the induced (almost canonical) partition function of a small system pertained in a bigger one. The total system is microcanonically distributed. For simplicity, we shall suppose that the both systems are homogeneous and that the contact energy can be neglected. The total system has a volume $V + v$ and the little system has a volume v .

The goal of this exercise is to determine how to obtain a well defined expansion in v/V . This is not trivial and bears many resemblance with the debated extraction of the background in quantum cosmology.

The total system has an energy E . Thus the number of states (to be more precise, the density of states) can be expressed as

$$\Omega_{total}(E) = \int_0^E d\epsilon \Omega_V(E - \epsilon) \omega(\epsilon) \quad (61)$$

where $\Omega_V(E - \epsilon)$ is the number of states when the rest of the big system with volume V has an energy $E - \epsilon$ and where $\omega(\epsilon)$ is the number of states of the little system with energy ϵ .

Two alternative ways to evaluate this quantity will be considered and compared. The first one consists in neglecting completely the energy of the little system (this seems legitimate since the ratio of the mean energies $\bar{\epsilon}/(E - \bar{\epsilon})$ scales like v/V) and in developing around the *vacuum* solution $\epsilon = 0$. To first order in the change of $\Omega_V(E - \epsilon)$ in ϵ , one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{total;1}(E) &\simeq \Omega_V(E) \int_0^E d\epsilon e^{-\beta_1 \epsilon} \omega(\epsilon) \\ &= \Omega_V(E) z(\beta_1) \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

⁷ Moreover upon considering the set of local constraint, this restriction on Ω might be re-enforced. We hope to return on that point in a next publication

where the inverse temperature β_1 is defined by $\beta_1 = -\partial_\epsilon \ln(\Omega_V(E - \epsilon))$ evaluated at $\epsilon = 0$ and where $z(\beta)$ designates the canonical partition function of the small system.

The second method consists in taking into account the *mean* energy of the little system $\epsilon = \bar{\epsilon}$ determined by the saddle point of eq. (61). This saddle expresses, as usual, the equality of the temperatures:

$$\partial_\epsilon \ln \Omega_V(E - \epsilon) + \partial_\epsilon \ln \omega(\epsilon) = 0 \quad (63)$$

where

$$\beta_2 = \partial_E \ln \Omega_V(E - \bar{\epsilon}) \quad (64)$$

The derivative is now evaluated at the saddle point energy $\epsilon = \bar{\epsilon}$. Then, to first order in the *change* in energy, i.e. $\epsilon - \bar{\epsilon}$, the partition function for the little system reads

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{total;2}(E) &\simeq \Omega_V(E - \bar{\epsilon}) \int_0^E d\epsilon e^{-\beta_2(\epsilon - \bar{\epsilon})} \omega(\epsilon) \\ &= \Omega_V(E - \bar{\epsilon}) e^{\beta_2 \bar{\epsilon}} z(\beta_2) \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

To this *linear* order in the development of the density of the big system Ω_V , the only difference between the two approaches lies in the difference in the temperatures only. Furthermore, one finds that $\beta_1 - \beta_2$ scales like v/V . Therefore if one takes the thermodynamical limit at this moment, i.e. $E \rightarrow \infty, V \rightarrow \infty$ with E/V fixed, both methods give the same results.

However, this is no longer the case if one wants to evaluate finite size effects, that is the fact that the big system has a finite heat capacity. Then, the difference between the two developments show up to second order in the energy fluctuation. (This is inevitable since $\beta_1 - \beta_2$ is of the order of v/V .) Indeed, by developing $\Omega_V(E - \epsilon)$ to second order in ϵ , one has

$$\Omega_{total;1}(E) = \Omega_V(E) \int_0^E d\epsilon e^{-\beta_1 \epsilon} e^{-\beta_1^2 \epsilon^2 / 2C_V} \omega(\epsilon) \quad (66)$$

in the first case and

$$\Omega_{total;2}(E) = \Omega_V(E - \bar{\epsilon}) \int_0^E d\epsilon e^{-\beta_2(\epsilon - \bar{\epsilon})} e^{-\beta_2^2(\epsilon - \bar{\epsilon})^2 / 2C_V} \omega(\epsilon) \quad (67)$$

in the second case. We have neglected the difference in the heat capacity of the big system (defined by $\partial_\epsilon^2 \ln \Omega(E - \epsilon) = -\beta^2/C_V$) which is induced by the different “background” energies E and $E - \bar{\epsilon}$, since C_V appears in the correction term only.

It is convenient to introduce the entropies $s = \ln \omega(\bar{\epsilon})$, $S = \ln \Omega(E - \bar{\epsilon})$ as well as their relations with the mean energies: $s = \xi_1 \beta \bar{\epsilon} = \xi_2 v \beta^3$ and $S = \xi_1 \beta (E - \bar{\epsilon}) = \xi_2 V \beta^3$. In those equations, the factors ξ_i are dimensionless and of the order of 1. It is also convenient to relate the specific heats to the entropies of both systems as $C_V = \xi_3 S$ and $c_v = \xi_3 s = \langle (\epsilon - \bar{\epsilon})^2 \rangle \beta^2$. Then one finds that the mean correction in the first case scales like

$$\langle \epsilon^2 \rangle \frac{\beta^2}{C_V} = \frac{s^2}{S} \frac{1}{\xi_1^2 \xi_3} = \frac{v^2 \beta^3}{V} \frac{\xi_2}{\xi_1^2 \xi_3} \quad (68)$$

while in the second case it scales only like

$$\langle(\epsilon - \bar{\epsilon})^2\rangle \frac{\beta^2}{C_V} = \frac{c_v}{C_V} = \frac{s}{S} = \frac{v}{V} \quad (69)$$

These results follows from the fact that, while the temperature is essentially fixed by the big system, it is the little one which determines, at a given temperature, what are the mean quadratic fluctuations, i.e. the width around the saddle energy ϵ . Notice that there is no need to differentiate the temperatures to that order in v/V .

By inspection of eqs. (68, 69), one sees that only the second development is really a power series in v/V . Instead, in the first case, the corrections contains the factor $v^2\beta^3/V$ which is ambiguous because it can be much bigger or much smaller than one when $v \ll V$. Indeed, it suffices to consider a system such that $s \ll S$ but with $s^2 > S$.

The lesson is that when one wants to compute finite size effects, i.e. first order correction in v/V , it is mandatory to take the mean energy of the little system into account upon evaluating the temperature. the zeroth order “classical” solution which corresponds to the background from which the temperature is computed. The parallelism between these developments and the one appearing in eqs. (41, 49) is manifest. *corresponds zeroth order “classical” solution which In this respect we want to point out that the factor $e^{\beta_2\bar{\epsilon}}$ of eq. (65) finds its perfect counterpart in ref. [10] wherein the Schroedinger time (β) dependent equation differs from the usual one by $e^{it\bar{\epsilon}}$. Its origin is identical to our, i.e. the background (equilibrium) is determined through a saddle point which does involve the mean “matter” energy $\bar{\epsilon}$.

References

- [1] C. J. Isham, *Canonical Quantum Gravity and the Problem of the time*, In “Integrable Systems, Quantum Groups and Quantum Field Theories” Kluwer Academic Publishers, London 1993. see also gr-qc/9210011
- [2] J. B. Hartle, in “Gravitation and Cosmology” edited by B. Carter and J. Hartle, Plenum Press (1986)
- [3] R. Brout, *On time*, Proceedings to the First Sakharov Conference (1991)
- [4] V. Lapchinski and V. Rubakov, Acta Phys. Pol. B10 (1979) 1041
- [5] T. Banks, Nucl. Phys. B249 (1985) 332
- [6] J. Halliwell and S. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D31 (1985) 1777
- [7] R. Brout, Found. Phys. 17 (1987) 603
- [8] J. Halliwell, Phys. Rev. D36 (1987) 3626
- [9] A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. D39 (1989) 1116

- [10] R. Brout and G. Venturi, Phys. Rev. D39 (1989) 2436
- [11] C. Kiefer and T. Singh, Phys. Rev. D44 (1991) 1067
- [12] C. Kiefer, *The semiclassical approximation to quantum gravity*, in “Canonical Gravity-from Classical to Quantum” ed. J. Ehlers and H. Friedrich (Springer, Berlin 1994), gr-qc/9312015
- [13] G. Lifschytz, S. Mathur and M. Ortiz, *A Note on the Semi-Classical Approximation in Quantum Gravity*, gr-qc/9412040
- [14] J. M. Jauch and F. Rorlich, The Theory of Photons and Electrons, Springer Verlag, NY. (1980)
- [15] J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. 82 (1951) 664
- [16] N.D. Birrel and P.C.W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space*, Cambridge University Press (1982).
- [17] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, Freeman, San Francisco, (1973)
- [18] R. Parentani, J. Katz and I. Okamoto, Class. and Quant. Grav. **12** (1995) 1663
- [19] R. Parentani, Nucl. Phys. B **454** (1995) 227 and Nucl. Phys. B **465** (1996) 175
- [20] R. Parentani, *Time dependent perturbation theory in Quantum Cosmology* LPTENS 96/46 preprint (1996)
- [21] R. Parentani, *Pair creation in Quantum Cosmology*, in preparation